

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/683,853

Applicant(s)

ZENG ET AL.

Examiner

Carlos Lopez

Art Unit

1731

**All Participants:**(1) Carlos Lopez(2) Hanh Phan**Status of Application:** Pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 27 May 2004**Time:** 3pm**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.****Rejection(s) discussed:**102(b) Burrus Rejection**Claims discussed:**1-10, 12, 18-28**Prior art documents discussed:**Burrus**Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**See Continuation Sheet**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature - If appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was noted to applicant that the Burrus reference still read on the instant invention because the term "generally quartz material" is indistinguishable from silica quartz preform. In order to advance prosecution, applicant thus agreed to place claims 6-7 in its independent form, cancel claims 1, 3, 18-23 and change the dependency of claims 2, 4-5, and 12 to claim 6. Additionally, it was agreed to cancel product claims 24-26 as being non-elected by the original presentation of the method claims.